

Page 12 Application No. 10/526,542

REMARKS

Mr Clayes, my patent advisor, has made a mistake in the description of my invention. (I went to him, rather than doing the job myself, and I gave him my full confidence, because he works as an engineer at GEVERS, a company recognised as specialists in this type of work.)

He considers that Mr Baker's system is the same as mine, with the exception of the attachment method, i.e. fixed to the bicycle at two points rather than the single point in my case. Beyond that, and rather bizarrely, he barely mentions my universal fixing system and the system for setting a universal arm which is designed differently from any other known system. A real novelty!

Indeed, the differences are enormous; for example, in Mr Baker's case part (16), which has two points of attachment to the bicycle rather than a single universal one, does not have the locating holes (17)!

My analogous part (5) does have them, while Mr Baker's part (14) does not play the part of my part (2). In other words part (14) is not designed to open so that parts can be set relative to one another as do my parts (5) and (2), which only serve for final adjustment or tightening. Mr Baker's part (14) remains mobile, as do the pivot pin housed in part (16) and that housed in part (10). Here Mr Baker has effectively created a double pivot represented by a round tube generally taking the form of a rectangular parallelepiped fitted into the housing of part (10) and the housing of part (16).

The double pivot (14) remains free, and part (10) can rotate towards the rear of the bicycle (see figure 3) and slides slightly between the rectangular parallelepiped double pivot represented by (14), before coming up against (28). My system is quite different, as my part (5) (contrary to what my patent agent stupidly said) does not involve a pivot, but rather two setting screws to be slackened off before setting parts (2) and (5) as desired relative to one another as required for a given assembly. After that these two interconnected pieces (2) and (5) effectively form a single piece. Part (5) thus does not include the pivot pin, unlike Mr Baker's part (16).

Again in contrast to Mr Baker, my part (2) does not represent a double pivot like Mr Baker's part (14); my part (2) is actually an independent part with quite specific roles which differ from those of Mr Baker's part (14).

Firstly, part (2) of my system forms a universal arm with part (5).

Secondly, part (2) also serves as an extension making it possible to put the drive system in contact with a bicycle wheel located a long way from the mounting point, e.g. on a traditional Dutch bicycle.

Thirdly, this part (2) has multiple mounting points (12) allowing the mounting point to be selected optimally. Mounting either the single pivot or a mounting for my device patented as EP1593593; in the case that my device EP1593593 is fitted, there is no longer any pivot point on my universal arm.

This is thus a new object, truly inventive and novel.

Page 14 Application No. 10/526,542

Explanations:

Mr Depoilly system is an adjustable motor chassis, forming part of the bicycle frame, this adjustable motor chassis having as its function maintaining the contact between drive roller and the bicycle wheel with a certain level of pressure.

My system is not a motor chassis but a universal adjustable arm which can be attached to 90% of bicycles by a single mounting point. This can be used to attach either: a pivot that receives the drive motor chassis (this remaining free to pivot even while in use),

Or: the device in my patent EP1593593, which is an intermediate part between the universal arm and the motor chassis, this part being fixed to two of the multiple setting holes initially provided for either a pivot, the device in my patent EP1593593. For part (2) of my universal arm, this intermediate part is used to set or release the contact between the drive wheel and the bicycle wheel as desired using a lever (13) and a locking dog (15).